DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 467 RC 010 024

AUTHOR Mesa, Pete
TITLE Implications for In-Service Education of the Urban/Rural School Development Program Experience.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif.
PUB DATE 16 Dec 75
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Involvement; Decision Making; Educational Needs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Institutes (Training Programs); Leadership Training; Program Attitudes; Program Content; *Program Effectiveness; *Rural School Systems; *School Community Cooperation; *Training Techniques; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Urban Rural School Development Program

ABSTRACT

Community demands for more control of the schools and a teacher over-supply had great impact on the planners of the Urban/Rural School Development Program. Into its 5th year of operation, the program offers the only national experience for developing national strategies for inservice education. Distinguishing the program from other Federal educational programs are: its built-in parity mechanism that requires shared decision-making between school professionals and the community; its focus on inservice education needs of the school personnel involved with the children's education; the direct involvement of an advocate Leadership Training Institute; and its flexible guidelines within a broad category of need. The program has found that teachers respond favorably to inservice education. High parity sites demonstrate that retention of teacher commitment over time is a function of diverse activities which acknowledge that the needs are complex and call for accountability and support from all segments of the school-community. Parity has proven to be a useful process for dealing with teacher reluctance to express deficiencies and training needs. Four basic mechanisms have evolved in the program for delivering inservice education: the resident professor model; the college or university affiliation with on-site training; the consultant firm affiliation; and the "shop for services" model. Each has advantages and disadvantages. The resident professor model appears to be the most promising. (NQ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143467

DRAFT FOR SUBMITTAL

Approved for ERIC
19-08-77

IMPLICATIONS FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION OF THE URBAN/RURAL SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Pete Mesa
Executive Director
Urban/Rural School Development Program
Leadership Training Institute

Stanford University
Stanford, California

December 16, 1975

RC010034

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Pete Mesa
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS"

It is obvious that In-Service Education will receive increasing attention from Federal and State Education offices and from institutions of higher education. The reasons are clear. The teacher shortage is over and so is the concern of these institutions for it. Criticisms of schools continues as does the pressures to change and improve them. Teachers are central in the process of education and since change and improvement can no longer be hoped for through the infusion of large numbers of new and better prepared teachers into the schools, the target for change will now be the teacher already in service.

The Urban/Rural program now into its 5th year of operation is a national experiment in In-Service Education. Though its goals are considerably broader, it offers, I believe, the only national experience for developing national strategies for In-Service Education.

The purpose of this paper is to offer the experiences of the Urban/Rural School Development program to the designers of what appears to be a broad and deep study of the pote tial of In-Service Education for improving the nation's schools.

The paper will attempt to describe the social forces and events that shaped Urban/Rural; its unique features and experiences and their value for planning future In-Service Education programs, its experiences related to the issues posed by the directors of the study, and some summary statements.

The reader is cautioned to take this treatment of the Urban/Rural program very tentatively. The views presented here are based almost entirely on my observations and experiences as Executive Director of the Leadership Training Institute, the national technical assistance arm of the project. Though the position has given me a very favorable vantage point from which to view the activities of the sites, at this time, before the formal program evaluation is completed, these admittedly subjective observations of the program experience

are offered to those concerned with the design of a national strategy for In-Service Education with the knowledge that this report may be somewhat premature. However, there is a need to proceed with the task of improving In-Service Education and we hope the Urban/Rural experience will be useful for that purpose.

The Urban/Rural School Development Program was conceived in 1968 just as the full impact of the Civil Rights upheaval was being felt by the American educational establishment. The political and racial turmoil that resulted brought about a radical shift in the attitudes of the public toward government and its institutions, especially the schools. Educators had traditionally formulated educational plans, interpreted them to the public, and then tried to promote support for them. Now feelings ran high that the community should and must participate actively in the creation of policy. Parent groups wanting access to the educational process organized everywhere and demanded participation and improvement in areas that educators had long held as their domains.

The Federal funding establishment had the message delivered to it clearly and emphatically. At a meeting held in Tucson, Arizona by the National Advisory Council in May 1968 to review prospective proposals for the Training of Teacher Trainers Programs, all 65 of the proposals considered were rejected because their community involvement components did not respond strongly enough to the demands of the times.

Though it was born in this climate, two events influenced the form of Urban/Rural more specifically. One was a visit by the Urban/Rural Planning Task force to a school in the Ocean Hill Brownsville District in Brooklyn that had just gone through the community control struggle with the New York Teachers Union. The other was the assassination of Martin Luther King which gave tremendous thrust to the Black community's appeals for control of their schools and communities.

"Community control" during later negotiations was modified to "parity in decision-making between school and community"; nevertheless the events of the times compelled that community control be designed into Urban/Rural even in some compromised form.

The Civil Rights movement was not the only social change that stamped the character of the Urban/Rural program. A predicted, but quickly developing "teacher over-supply" also caught the educational establishment by surprise, high geared in the opposite direction and pre-occupied almost entirely with filling the teacher shortage and improving the preparation of new teachers. Indeed, the Bureau of Educational Development (BEPD) was formed in 1968 "to remedy personnel shortages in education, to consolidate education man power training programs scattered throughout the Office of Education, and to reform training for education professionals." By 1970, the "teacher over-supply" problem had arrived in full force.

To sum up then, community demands for more control of the schools and a teacher over-supply were two major social changes that had great impact on the planners of the Urban/Rural program. The question is, what unique programmatic features did the program respond with to the demands of these social changes?

PARITY IN DECISION-MAKING BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM.

The single most unique and powerful difference in Urban/Rural from its sister programs is the built-in parity mechanism that requires shared decision-making between school professionals and community. Parity as a concept had been around for some time but never officially defined so as to make it operational.

Don Davies, Associate Commissioner of Education, stated at one time that the "parity principle was an important factor in all BEPD programs, but not parity in decision-making." "We leave the interpretation of that policy to

each individual program with the Bureau," he said. Bill Smith, then director of the Division of School Programs, which housed Urban/Rural, authored the first working definition. He defined it as "mutual, collaborative decision-making on the part of those rendering and those receiving services." The instrument by which this mutual, collaborative decision-making was to be done in Urban/Rural was a School-Community Council (SCC).

The Program Information Document that has served as the program's guidelines describes the function of the SCC's:

> The School-Community Council shall be comprised of elected representatives from the ranks of teachers, administrators and other school staff; and the community (which will include students). The concept of parity should be reflected in the composition of the Council, with at least half the membership comprising other than the school staff. That a School-Community Council should be considered as an integral part of a school district. With the acceptance of an Urban/Rural School Development Program Grant, every system has accepted this option as a condition for participation in the program. The school district in accepting the Urban/Rural School Development Program has accepted an obligation to delegate such decision-making authority to the School-Community Council. Authority delegated to the School-Community Council does not suppliant that of the school board nor the authority of state and local governments. The Councils must operate within the requirements of Federal, State and local laws. <u>However, it is expected that local education agencies will provide to the School-Community Councils the broadest possible discretion for making decisions relating to the design and implementation of education personnel training programs for the designated schools within a project</u>.

The Urban/Rural program would be unique among the USOE programs in advocating parity for communities in decision-making.

What has the experience with parity been? The concept has demonstrated unexpected power to survive. All the School-Community Councils have outlasted Superintendents, Board members, and others that were openly hostile and wanted to be rid of the program. All sites accepted the program with some uneasiness. But in none of the sites have the fears and suspicions of those who opposed community involvement materialized to the degree feared. This

is not to say it has been easy at all of the sites. However, even the most originally skeptical and anxious opponents of Urban/Rural today admit that their fears were not realized and that the program has resulted in some benefit for the schools.

The idea of parity has posed a threat to school boards and administrators of many of the Urban/Rural sites. The main concern was how a staff could serve what amounted to two boards of education and two administrations? Also school people feared the intrusion and interference of uninformed community people in professional educational matters. However, the Councils at present enjoy various states of autonomy with differing degrees of parity both internally and between themselves and their local boards. To be sure, about half of the councils function somewhere between partial and total cooptation, - but the other half have sustained a level of parity much beyond the expectations of many of those who have been involved with the program since or near its beginning.

The role that a successful School-Community Council can perform for the benefit of a school was probably best expressed by a superintendent of one of the high parity sites. "A school board concerns itself with policy and fiscal matters and does not have time to examine educational needs. On the other hand, the School-Community Council can devote itself to examining and responding to the educational needs of the children."

What difference has high parity or low parity decision-making made on an activity like In-Service Education? Or to ask the question more specifically, Is there a link between higher parity and program impact on teachers and students?

Sites rated the top three on parity have generated the most diverse and highest number of staff development activities. One, a rural site has collaborated with the LTI in the production of a film documenting the impact of

Urban/Rural on its schools. Another, a mid-sized urban site has taken the bold step of incorporating itself and has applied for and won a grant of $330,000 to continue its activities after the funding of Urban/Rural ends. The third held a festival recently to which its community, other sites and out-of-town guests were invited to observe the Urban/Rural impact in the classrooms and to visit an exhibit of the materials,projects etc. produced as a result of the training.

Staff and community cohesion on the SCC's and in their constituencies is so strong that they have produced changes in modes of instruction, improved school climates, reduced drop out rates and improved student performance despite surges of opposition from their boards and some segments of their communities.

Not all the impact can be credited to the high parity sites. At two of the sites ranked in lowest quartile of parity, substantial reading gains have been achieved as a result of the Urban/Rural training. However, at one of these sites, despite the gain in reading achievement, alienation between school and the community at large continues to be serious. Some community and staff are unhappy with the narrow focus of the program and feel that their concerns about the children's affective development are not reflected in the program objectives. Teacher participation in the training activities has become increasingly difficult to maintain and conflicts between staff on the SCC and in the school appear to be intensifying.

Other observations of the differences between high and low parity sites are: low parity sites tend to focus on narrow objectives. Also, low parity sites dominated by community tend to place more blame on teachers and consequently these in-service education activities are characterized by efforts to "sensitize" or "humanize" the teacher. On the other hand, low parity sites

dominated by staff focus mainly on student or family "deficiencies", that students are not motivated at home, for example. Implicit in the objectives selected is the assumption that the locus of the problems is in students and their families or with the teachers, depending on which point of view dominates.

Given these differences between low and high parity sites, what are the arguments for school-community collaborative decision-making related to in-service education?

Despite the impact of Urban/Rural training on some of the low parity sites the alienation and distrust people in these poverty communities feel towards their schools is pervasive and deep. Most school personnel, on the other hand, feel that it is unfair to ask them to make up for deficits of poverty that they believe the children suffer from. It appears that the guilt, anger and frustration parents and teachers feel, each project upon the other. Hence the difference in character of staff dominated in-service program decisions as opposed to community dominated ones. The diversity of activities observed in high parity sites reflects, we believe, the dialogue, exchange and mutual education that takes place between staff and community when both are responsible and accountable for the program decisions they make. The process is far from always being easy or peaceful, nevertheless it appears that the School-Community Council allows essentially hostile groups to work out their suspicions of each other and reach mutually agreeable goals and actions. In short, parity becomes a process by which parents can feel some control of their children's education and where teachers can communicate their problems and needs.

There are other reasons as to why both community and school people should determine in-service education programs collaboratively. It is one thing to know intellectually that there is great variation in the environments in which schools are set. However, the impact on the observer who actually experiences

the tremendous differences as one has been able to see in this program, is virtually over-powering. One Indian site is 60 miles from the nearest town and suffers a 90% yearly turnover in its teaching staff. The children who attend these schools have as minimal contact with the majority culture as is possible in the continental United States. Another site is located in the midst of the most devastated slum of the largest city in the country. A third is located in a former mining center in which this industry has not provided economic support to the community for 30 years. The conditions of isolation, insulation, economic deterioration, and many other factors create or maintain subcultures and life styles almost totally foreign to the average teacher. Even those from those communities who teach in the schools tend to have the effects of these conditions erased as they undergo the typical teacher preparation.

If we have learned anything from the opportunity to work with and experience this great diversity of school populations and settings it is that there is so much in each community that has uniquely shaped the values, relationships, motivations and aspirations of the children that there is no possible way for the present patterns of pre-service education to prepare school staffs to be responsive to their needs and priorities. It is this knowledge of the uniqueness of their children that the community members of the School-Community Council bring to the interaction between themselves and the professionals.

FOCUS ON IN-SERVICE EDUCATION OF STAFF

Another salient if not so unique feature of the Urban/Rural program is that it is aimed at In-Service Education. However, great flexibility is allowed sites to determine the in-service education needs not only of teachers, but also of students, community persons, administrators, anyone in the school involved with the education of the children. Other federal educational programs such as ESEA Title I permit or encourage in-service training for staff. But Urban/Rural was the first BEPD program in which it was the main focus. And, of course, given

the parity requirement, the twist added was that the in-service needs of staff were to be determined collaboratively by both community and school people through the School-Community Council mechanism.

AN ADVOCATE LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE

Other federal education programs have had leadership training institutes to provide technical assistance to their sites. However, USOE felt that the structures of other LTI's typically consisting of a director (usually part-time), an associate director, and a secretary plus a panel of consultants for field contact would not serve the technical assistance needs of Urban/Rural sites. Don Davies described the new LTI role. "The needs of this program were for continuous, intensive help from the outside so the process would work." Making the process work has meant direct involvement by the LTI in establishing the School-Community Councils at each site, training them to function as decision-makers, writing by-laws, writing proposals, giving the sites consumer advice, training leaders, mediating between council and school boards, etc. The need for LTI support by the Councils has decreased as they have matured, but its advocate role in the beginning was essential for the survival of most of the programs. Since then the LTI has provided training workshops in evaluation, curriculum, community involvement and socio-cultural education as well as technical assistance upon request to individual sites. The LTI through its workshops, conferences, newsletter, etc. has served as a unifying element for the Urban/Rural sites.

The kind of advocacy role that an entity like the Leadership Training Institute has been called upon to provide the project sites is as a consumer educator, protector and advisor. There is no question but that some of the sites have learned that the purchase of services in the educational market is as much in the tradition of "good old American business" as the market for used

automobiles. Virtually the same consumer cautions and wariness have been needed. Recently, an evaluation package was offered a site by a consulting firm for the price of $10,000. The site asked the LTI to give them an opinion as to its worth. The advice to the site by a member of the LTI staff with a national reputation in curriculum and evaluation was that the charges were far in excess of the worth of the service proposed by the consultants. This and other experiences force us to conclude that school systems need some source of consumer education and advice, naturally from a source that is not at the same time in market competition for their money.

GREAT FLEXIBILITY WITHIN A BROAD CATEGORY OF NEED

The great flexibility and freedom given the School-Community Councils, particularly in the early years is certainly unique among federal programs. The first two paragraphs of the foreword to the Program Information Document by Associate Commissioner Don Davies that served as the Urban/Rural guidelines declares SCC's autonomy.

> The Urban/Rural School Development Program, under the Education Professions Act (EPDA), has been designed to build on the talents and energies of dedicated, experienced personnel who are now at work in poverty area schools. They have many ideas about the needs of children in their schools, and they will play the major role in developing and implementing changes in schools participating in the Urban/Rural School Development Program.
>
> They will join all the people concerned with the education offered by the school-administrators, paraprofessionals, students, parents, and the community - in writing a new script for educational performance within the school. The Office of Education will not dictate to local projects. Local school superintendents will not design them. They will be the creation and responsibility of the entire school-staff and local community. The result will be a school with a new environment which is stimulating and satisfying to the child and teacher alike, and, in which the academic achievement and human development of children will be significantly increased.

Those were strong and optimistic statements that were to undergo much negotiation, but surprisingly, they have survived with relatively little modification.

WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED FROM THE URBAN/RURAL EXPERIENCE THAT RELATES TO THE PROBLEMS POSED BY THE STUDY IN IN-SERVICE EDUCATION?

We have described the origins of Urban/Rural and related the events and social changes that shaped it. We have attempted to describe the unique features that distinguish it from other federal educational programs.

The question now in the fifth year of the program is, what has been learned from the Urban/Rural experiences, about In-Service Education? More specifically, what has been learned that can help resolve some of the problems that have generally plagued In-Service Education efforts in the past.

HAVE TEACHERS BEEN RECEPTIVE TO THE TRAINING?

One major problem with In-Service Education is that teachers experience with it has been negative for a number of too frequently recurring reasons. The training has been unrelated to their needs. It has been conducted in "one shot" week end workshops or conferences not sustained enough for teachers to learn, practice and assimilate the training. It has been conducted on the teacher's time rather than during the work day and after training, there has been little follow-up support to assist the teacher to implement the training.

Most Urban/Rural staff development programs have tried to remove these causes of negative teacher attitudes in-service training. In-Service Education has been based on needs assessments that included staff and frequently parents. The training has been continual and sustained. In short, Urban/Rural programs have attempted, by including teachers in the planning, to build in safeguards to those negative characteristics of traditional in-service education listed above. What have been the results? These can be best illustrated by a project wide survey conducted by the Stanford LTI as part of its total program evaluation work. The survey included 982 respondents that included various role groups:

Team Managers (project directors), Council Chairpersons, Council Members, Teachers, Administrators, Urban/Rural Staff, Parents, School Development Team Members, Students and Paraprofessionals. The survey asked all the role group members listed (including 314 teachers) to rate the impact of the Urban/Rural Program at their sites.

Figure I

WHAT IS THE PRESENT IMPACT OF URBAN/RURAL AT THIS SITE ON TEACHERS IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS?

	MORE SINCE U/R	LESS SINCE U/R	NO CHANGE	DON'T KNOW
a. New ideas for teaching.	80.0%	0.2%	3.3%	10.9%
b. New materials for the classroom.	72.9%	0.4%	8.8%	11.5%
c. New knowledge of children.	70.0%	0.6%	8.5%	14.5%
d. New attitudes toward children.	67.9%	0.4%	10.5%	14.7%
e. New ways of identifying (diagnosing) learning/reading problems.	68.4%	0.7%	8.5%	14.9%
f. New types of contact with parents.	57.1%	1.1%	19.5%	15.2%
g. Opportunities to upgrade professional competencies.	70.5%	0.8%	4.0%	17.3%
h. Seek input from staff and community in planning.	60.9%	1.3%	9.9%	20.4%

Items A through E should be indicators of program impact on the classroom from which one could infer that favorable attitudes towards the training by all role groups including the 314 teachers exists.* No claims are made at this time about

*The teachers' responses are not singled out because submission of this paper was due before the computer run on teacher respondents could be completed.

actual measureable impact on children in performance, this part of the evaluation is not yet complete, but we feel safe in claiming that a high proportion of teachers in the program hold favorable attitudes towards in-service education. Perhaps there will be further corroboration of this as we move deeper into the program evaluation process.

WHAT MIGHT BE A WORKING DEFINITION OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION?

A definition of In-Service Education has been needed. A number of continuing teacher education activities have been charged to Urban/Rural resources that are difficult to justify in terms of direct service to students. We need to examine the assumptions that underlie the acceptance, promotion, and subsidization of many activities that are classified as in-service education. Historically, courses taken by teachers in college and university campuses for which they have contracted as individuals, with the chief incentives being the acquisition of course credits for salary increases have been accepted as in-service education. Staff are given salary increments on the assumption that what they learn will be of service to their clients. The fact is that such courses rarely result in direct improvement of services to the children. The knowledge and competencies acquired are remote from their needs as teachers or those of their students. Such education might be more accurately defined as career development (for those who seek advancement or change in jobs) or professional development, meaning that the education is broad and of general professional benefit, but not designed to develop specific competencies related to specific service needs.

Considerable hostility and conflict has developed in Urban/Rural sites in which In-Service Education has taken the form of college courses leading towards advanced degrees and higher pay. The higher pay is not resented; what is resented, however, is the communities inability to see connection between the needs of school and the remote form of in-service education observed. In some sites, the

resentment has been accentuated when the newly credentialed staff go on to better paying positions in other districts with degrees earned at their site's expense.

The Urban/Rural Experience compels us to define In-Service Education as teacher training based on assessments that reveal the present and anticipated needs of teachers and all other staff to serve their school and its community with optimuum effectiveness; with the priority of needs and the criteria for effectiveness being collaboratively established by school staff and representatives of the community.

Our observation is that community members of an SCC support In-Service Education programs, when they can see a close match between identified needs and the training activities.

WHAT IS THE URBAN/RURAL EXPERIENCE WITH TEACHER RELUCTANCE TO EXPRESS DEFICIENCIES AND ASK FOR TRAINING?

Among the problems posed by the Study in In-Service Education is that "the social situation of the teaching profession makes it very difficult for teachers to comfortably express their deficiencies or to ask for training." We're not sure that the problem described here has been visibly manifest among the Urban/Rural sites. Perhaps it has not been observed because the difficulty and discomfort in expressing deficiencies has been acted out in other forms. What has been noted is a strong tendency for teachers to locate the problems outside themselves. The home or child, the administration, the lack of resources and facilities etc. receive the blame. On the other hand, parents and children tend to place the problem on teachers, their methods or the school in general. The experience at a rural midwest site represents the situation typical of many other sites. In this case, the teachers blamed their problems and poor student performance on apathetic parents, poor family life and the welfare syndrone of "deadened motivation." In contrast, the parents described the teachers as unfriendly, condescending

and uncaring and describes the school as an alien place. At this site, the School-Community Council, the mechanism by which these differences might be resolved and transformed into mutually agreed upon needs and goals was unfortunately not sufficiently deve..ped. Sites that have worked out these problems seem to have School-Community Councils that have developed the skills to conduct broad based needs assessments in which staff, community, students and administrators all participated. Processes have been used that reveal the causes, conditions and histories of problems in such ways that staff and parents do not need to feel personal guilt, but rather can work together to examine them objectively and for purposes of acting upon them.

WHAT STRATEGIES AND MECHANISMS FOR PROVIDING IN-SERVICE EDUCATION HAVE EMERGED IN URBAN/RURAL?

Four basic strategies or mechanisms have evolved. The resident professor model; the college or university afiliation with on-site training; consultant - firm afiliation, the "shop for services" model.

Of the four, the Resident Professor model seems to be the most creative and promising idea. It's a variation of the field based teacher education but we believe the form it has taken in Urban/Rural may be original. Typically, two college or university level teacher trainers are contracted, usually with these conditions:

1. They reside in the school-community.
2. They devote full time to working with the site staff.
3. They observe teachers and do demonstration teaching in the classrooms.
4. Their training is based either on assessed needs of the staff or on needs resulting from the implementation of an educational program.
5. They help identify and select other trainers or technical assistance.

6. They make the resources of their home university or college available to the site.

7. They report regularly to the School-Community Council.

The advantages of this mode of providing In-Service Education are obvious: the training is continuous, it is related to the needs and goals of the school, there is time for confidence and rapport to develop between trainers and staff.

The disadvantages and cautions learned are that such professor types are quite difficult to find. They work out best when they take a real interest in the school and the community and when they project a willingness to learn from as well as teach staff and community persons. The ultimate compliment given such a trainer by teachers is "he's great with the kids and he can demonstrate in the classroom what he teachers!" A hard reality intrudes, however, sometimes colleges have unloaded their rejects on unwary sites.

The college or university affiliation model is probably the most commonly used among the sites. It is different from the resident professor model in that usually a college representative coordinates the site and college transactions and deploys college staff as needed or as planned. Training is frequently done on-site and sometimes the content is even tailored to the needs of the site. Councils, usually through their executive officers, called team managers, negotiate these conditions. A solid learning has emerged from the Urban/Rural experience with colleges and universities. That is that much can be gained by tough negotiation. Sites have won agreement from colleges to tailor courses to the training needs of sites as determined by the sites, even to give degree credit for such courses, and to reduce fees when the site provides the facilities for training, the captive clientele, and the costs of all materials needed. In one or two instances, sites have located their own trainers and insisted that the university employ and assign them to the site!

Lest too rosy a picture be conveyed, the caveats learned are that in too many cases sites have become the captives of the colleges or universities through contractual agreements that gained few tailored responses to meet the needs of the sites.

Four sites have retained consulting firms as their main providers of training. In at least one case, they did so because of distrust of the local colleges. The team manager of that urban predominantly Black site said, "those colleges are the ones that keep turning out the teachers we have to re-train!"

The consulting firm provides the services within its capability. Usually, like the colleges they attempt to provide every service from proposal writing to evaluation of their own services. They help the site locate consultants for those needs outside their scope of competence. Our observation is that they have been more flexible and accommodating than the colleges or universities, and that they are more willing to respond to specific site needs.

There are several disadvantages inherent in this model. Sometimes the sites are subjected to as much salesmanship as service. It is hard to tell sometimes whether a site is "sold" a need or whether the need is real. They naturally tend to sell what they have packaged and what they can do best.

Some sites have no affiliation or resident professors. They assess their needs, map out their plans and then shop for services as they need them. Naturally the quality of their choices depends greatly on the competence of the staff and council members. Training in these cases appears in most cases sporadic and unpatterned.

WHAT OTHER EXPERIENCE DOES THE URBAN/RURAL PROGRAM HAVE TO OFFER THE DESIGN OF A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION?

The name of the project, Urban/Rural, literally means that it includes both urban and rural school systems. It is quite clear at this point that the imple-

mentation of In-Service Education has been most difficult and probably had the least impact in the huge urban complexes. Mid size urban centers have been more successful, but implementation has probably been easiest in rural communities. There are several factors involved: Unions in large urban centers such as New York and Newark, rigidly control use of the teacher's time. In one of these cities, the union scale for any after school or weekend participation in workshops is $9.00 per hour. A huge amount of this site's In-Service budget has gone to pay stipends to teachers. Understandably, community participants in training or planning expect renumeration also but are deeply resentful of the amount that teacher stipends drain from the program.

Rural teachers often have had little access to or the where-with-all for college beyond the minimum needed for credentialing. Isolation has kept many teaching innovations from reaching them. Also, because of the generally low power of unions in rural areas, teachers can be directed by administrative fiat to undergo training much more readily than in urban sites. Nevertheless, a difference in quality between low and high parity rural sites In-Service Education activities is evident. The focus at the low parity sites is narrow and aimed at notions of the children's deficits. That of high parity sites attends to community as staff perceptions of needs.

Like that of another BEPD project now expired, the Training Teacher Trainers Program, our experience has been that "projects appear most successful when their goals coincide with or reinforce local values, local priorities and interests and that enable activities to take place that are desirable from a local point of view; when goals are not incompatable with local values."

In-Service Education has been more successful at sites with SCC's that have realized their power, stuck to their guns, insisted on their autonomy and have not

let their goals be defined by expediency, pressures or role conflicts between council and board. Success also appears related to SCC's maintaining "constructive" tensions between themselves and other role groups in the school-community so that philosophical, cultural, methodological differences could be worked out.

The Urban/Rural program has had a five year cycle of operation to develop. Recently a sixth year was added as a result of USOE's decision to define the first as a planning year. It took at least two years for funding problems to be resolved, for needs to be assessed and translated into program plans and for a genuine implementation to be accomplished. Consequently, only in the last two or three years can it be said that the sites have fully implemented training programs. So little has been known about how to assess staff training needs for a specific school, it appears to us that time has been a critical variable in determining the successes in the Urban/Rural program. Successful sites have had to be very flexible. They have had to be willing to learn through trial and error and have had to keep a very experimental attitude towards their program activities.

Summary and Conclusions

Two important changes in the national environment determined the philosophy and focus of the Urban/Rural School Development Program. The civil rights movement and accompanying turmoil compelled the program designers to give the community parity with the school professionals in the governance of the program. The sudden teacher over-supply made the decision to improve schools through in-service staff development very timely. Present educational needs indicate that the Urban/Rural program has some important experiences to offer national and local educational policy makers who are working to meet these needs. Summed up they are:

1. The concept of community participation in decision-making on parity with school professionals and boards of education has proven viable.
2. Parity in decision-making between community and professionals has produced in-service education activities more numerous and diverse than at sites in which such parity was minimally achieved. The numbers and diversity of activities at the high parity sites reflects community as well as staff felt needs.
3. Program activities resulting from decision processes dominated by one or the other, staff or community, strongly indicate tendencies to scapegoating or displacement of guilt. The result is low credibility for program accomplishments and resentment of the implicit imposition of blame for educational failure by the dominant decision-makers on those who are the objects of the decision.
4. Because of the pervasive distrust and alienation between schools and many segments of their communities, both school and community need to be brought together in some process by which they can communicate, mutually educate, interact, collaboratively produce and be accountable for their children's educational programs.

5. Community and staff collaboration in decision-making requires leadership training, particularly of community persons.

6. Any governing body that buys services needs consumer counsel, but experience in Urban/Rural shows that this is more critical when community and lower echelon staff are involved in such decisions.

7. Flexible program guidelines within a broad category of need have been instrumental in producing diverse and extremely creative program activities in Urban/Rural. Urban/Rural sites represent the incredibly wide range of physical settings, populations, cultures, etc. in which children and teachers interact. It is inconceivable to one who has experienced this variety how any but the broadest, most flexible guidelines could apply.

8. The experiences of Urban/Rural is that teachers respond favorably to In-Service Education. Responses to their needs are offered in forms that do not cause undue imposition on their personal lives and goals. High parity sites demonstrate that retention of teacher commitment over time is a function of diversity of activities, activities that acknowledge that the needs are complex and that call for accountability and support from all segments of the school-community for responses to the children's needs. Narrow focused programs suffer symptoms of eroding teacher commitment, staff conflict over program objectives, etc.

9. A more precise definition of In-Service Education is needed. Valuable resources are being dissipated in activities that cannot be identified as in-service education with any justification.

10. Parity has proven to be a useful process for dealing with teacher reluctance to express deficiencies and needs for training. By having a strong say in determining their needs, and having a forum in which to express

their perceptions of the problems and at the same time hear and be free to confront the perceptions of the community. Teachers have tended to move with community toward cooperation in responding to the common goals of responding to educational needs of the children. These two equally empowered groups forced to confront and deal with each other have found cooperation more frequently than not, a more attractive alternative than conflict. Our observation is that cooperation begins with the expression and acceptance of the needs each feels in order to respond to the expectations of the other.

11. Four basic mechanisms have evolved in the program for delivering in-service education. Each has advantages and disadvantages. The resident professor model appears to be the most promising. It should be said here that the sites response to the idea (it has now spread to eight sites) probably represents a real need. That is that a typical staff needs the connection to the broad knowledge in the field that a university professor can provide. The district's typical resource teachers would usually be limited in this respect.

The Urban/Rural program evaluation should be completed in the spring of 1978. A number of the observations included in this paper may corroborate, some perhaps may be contradicted by data gathered and processed more systematically. Nevertheless, the experienced educator or researcher may find something of use here.